

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-12 and 14-29 are pending in the application. Claim 13 is canceled, and claims 22-29 are newly added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The intended scope of the claims is unchanged and no new matter is added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for providing information about recommended section headings. However, the applicants respectfully decline to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC 111(a), but are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77").

The Office action objects to the specification for not including FIG. 6 in the description of drawings; the specification is correspondingly amended herein.

The Office action objects to claims 7-13 and 21 for being in improper form; claims 7-13 and 21 are correspondingly amended herein.

The Office action rejects claims 1-6 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kawase et al. (EP 1225557, hereinafter Kawase) and Moller et al. (USP 6,984,934, hereinafter Moller). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The combination of Kawase and Moller fails to teach or suggest a method for driving a display device that includes applying a voltage within a specified voltage range that is above a fusing voltage and below a leakage threshold voltage to a light emitting element, within which voltage range the risk of short circuits between the electrodes is reduced, and controlling a duty cycle of the light emitting element, so that a desired light intensity is emitted from the light emitting element, as specifically claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-12 depend. Claim 14, upon which claims 15-21 depend, claims a display device with similar limitations.

Neither Kawase nor Moller address defining a voltage range within which the risk of short circuits between the electrodes of a display device is reduced. Specifically, neither Kawase nor Moller teach or suggest applying a voltage to the light emitting element that is above a fusing voltage and below a leakage threshold voltage, as claimed in each of claims 1 and 14.

The Office action asserts that "it is obvious to one skill[ed] in the art that in order to reduce the risk of short circuits between the electrodes, voltage needs to be applied within certain range. The applicants respectfully disagree. Conventional display devices operate 'rail-to-rail', wherein a pixel is coupled to opposing supply lines, and the range of the drive transistor extends from the value of one supply line (e.g. ground) to the value of the other supply line (e.g. Vdd).

Kawase teaches doubling the applied voltage applied to pixels and applying a 50% duty cycle for low-intensity gray scale values, to improve linearity. Above the mid-range of gray scale values, Kawase's device operates as a conventional display device (Kawase [0132]). If the desired intensity is black, Kawase drives the pixel fully-off (0/0 in Kawase's figures); if the desired intensity is white, Kawase drives the pixel fully-on (4/4, 8/8 in Kawase's figures). Kawase does not teach maintaining the voltage above a fusing voltage level, and does not teach maintaining the voltage below a leakage threshold voltage, as specifically claimed by the applicants.

Moller does not address the voltages applied to the light emitting elements.

Because the combination of Kawase and Moller fails to teach or suggest the elements of each of the applicants independent claims 1 and 14, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims claims 1-6 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kawase and Moller.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001